KUBITZKIA VAN DER WERFF, A SUPERFLUOUS NAME OR NOT?

Kostermans (1988) discussed the need for a new generic name to replace *Systemonodaphne* Mez and came to the conclusion that the new name *Kubitzkia* van der Werff (Taxon 35: 164. 1986) is superfluous. Kostermans's argument is that Meissner (1864) cited *Laurus geminiflora* Desv. as the basionym of his *Goeppertia geminiflora* with a question mark; his opinion is that citation of a doubtful synonym in the description of a new taxon rules out this doubtful synonym as the basionym of the new taxon and that, in the case of *Kubitzkia*, *Laurus geminiflora* Ham. is not the basionym of *Goeppertia geminiflora*, and therefore also not the type species of *Systemonodaphne* Mez. The difficulty is that here one is led to speculate whether Meissner, when he cited *Laurus geminiflora* Ham. as a basionym of his *Goeppertia geminiflora* with a question mark, accepted what he published or published what he did not accept (see Articles 34.1 and 34.2 of the Code). In his particular case, the choice is an easy one for the following reasons: A) Meissner (1864, p. 175), under his description of *Goeppertia* (?) *geminiflora*, cited the earlier references as follows: "*Laurus geminiflora* Desv. in Hamilt. Prodr. Fl. Ind. occ. p. 37. Walp. Ann. 1 p. 578? (non Reinw.)." In Walpers (1848), this species is cited as follows, "*L.* ? *geminiflora* Dsvx. in Hamilt. Prodr. 37 (nec Reinw. mss.)." It seems very likely that Meissner, in citing the Walpers reference, cited him correctly and included Walpers's question mark. This question mark reflected the doubt Walpers expressed about the correct generic placement of *Laurus geminiflora* Ham. and not any doubt from Meissner as to *L. geminiflora* being the basionym of *Goeppertia geminiflora*. B) Meissner (1864) also included lists of excluded species at the end of each genus and gave the generic placement he accepted. On p. 236 he lists "*L. geminiflora* Desv. = *Goeppertia* (?) *geminiflora*." When Meissner had doubt about the placement of certain species, he clearly expressed this; see p. 239: "*L. surinamensis* Sw. = Species obscura, cfr. *Oreodaphne guianensis* N.," or p. 236: "*L. dubia* Wall. = *Cinnamomum iners* Rw. δ ?" In my opinion, Meissner's treatment of *Goeppertia geminiflora* shows that Meissner accepted without doubt *Laurus geminiflora* Ham. as the basionym for his *Goeppertia geminiflora* and that for reasons explained earlier (van der Werff, 1986), *Kubitzkia* is the valid name for *Systemonodaphne* sensu Mez non sensu typi.

LITERATURE CITED

KOSTERMANS, A. J. G. H. 1988. What is the value of an interrogation mark in plant descriptions? Taxon 37: 132–133.

MEISSNER, C. F. 1864. Lauraceae. *In:* D.C., Prodr. 15: 1–260.

WALPERS, W. A. 1848. Annales Botanices Systematicae 1: 1–1127.

WERFF, H. VAN DER. 1986. *Kubitzkia* van der Werff, a new name for a genus of neotropical Lauraceae. Taxon 35: 164–166.

—Henk van der Werff, Missouri Botanical Garden, P.O. Box 299, St. Louis, Missouri 63166, U.S.A.